Random and free observables saturate the Tsirelson bound for CHSH inequality

Z. Yin[1,2], A. W. Harrow[3], M. Horodecki[1], M. Marciniak[1] and A. Rutkowski[1]
[1] *Faculty of Mathematics, Physics and Informatics, University of Gdańsk, 80-952 Gdańsk, Institute of Theoretical Physics and Astrophysics and National Quantum Information Centre in Gdańsk, 81-824 Sopot, Poland*
[2] *School of Mathematics and Statistics, Wuhan University, China*
[3] *Center for Theoretical Physics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge MA 02139, USA.*

Maximal violation of the CHSH-Bell inequality is usually said to be a feature of anticommuting observables. In this work we show that even random observables exhibit near-maximal violations of the CHSH-Bell inequality. To do this, we introduce so-called free observables which are freely independent in some quantum probability space. We also study the fine-grained uncertainty of a sequence of free or random observables, and use this to construct a steering inequality with large violation.

arXiv:1512.00223v2 [quant-ph] 8 Jan 2016

I. INTRODUCTION

The notion of quantum mechanics violating local realism was first raised by the work of A. Einstein, B. Podolsky and N. Rosen [1]. This was put on a rigorous and general footing by the revolutionary 1964 paper of J. S. Bell [2], which derived an inequality (now known as the Bell inequality) involving correlations of two observables. Bell showed that there is a constraint on any possible correlations obtained from local hidden variable models which can be violated by quantum measurements of entangled states. Later on, another Bell-type inequality which is more experimentally feasible was derived by J. F. Clauser, M. A. Horne, A. Shimony and R. A. Holt [3]. Since then, Bell inequalities have played a fundamental role in quantum theory and have had many applications in quantum information science (see [4] for a review).

In this paper, we mainly focus on the maximal violation of CHSH-Bell inequality [3]. It is well known that the *Tsirelson bound* $\sqrt{2}$ for CHSH-Bell inequality, which is the ratio of quantum and classical value, was first obtained by Tsirelson [5]. He also proved that the bound can be realized by using proper Pauli observables. Apart from above qubit case, it is possible to find dichotomic observables in high dimension [6, 7], as well as in continuous variable (infinite dimension) case [8], to obtain the Tsirelson bound. Recently, Y. C. Liang et. al. [9] have studied the possibility of violation of CHSH-Bell inequality by random observables. For bipartite qubits case, if two observers share a Bell state, they showed that the probability of violation is about 0.283 by randomly choosing measurement settings. However, their work does not involve the probability of the maximal violation.

So it is natural to ask following question: *Is it possible to maximally violate CHSH-Bell inequality by using random observables with high probability?* In this work, we will provide an affirmative answer to this question by using random observables in sufficient large dimensional Hilbert space. Thus in this asymptotic sense, maximally violating CHSH-Bell inequality is *generic* for random observables. On the other hand, in all known results the specific algebraic relations, namely, anti-commuting relations between the observables play an important role for the Tsirelson bound of CHSH-Bell inequality. However, this random approach reveals that there is another type of algebraic relations between observables which might lead to the Tsirelson bound of CHSH-Bell inequality. We call the observables, which satisfy those relations, *free observables.* It originates from a mathematical theory, called free probability [10, 11]. In fact, due to the mathematical terminology, those free observables are freely independent in some quantum probability space. A crucial point is that free observables can only exist in infinite dimension. Thus from this viewpoint it may go beyond the experimental realization. To be applicable for experiment, we are able to construct dichotomic observables by truncating some given free observables into finite dimension, by which the Tsirelson bound can be approximately obtained.

In another part of this work we have studied the fine-grained uncertainty relations of free or random observables, which was introduced by J. Oppenheim and S. Wehner [12]. It is more fundamental than the usual entropic uncertainty relations and it relates to the degree of violation of Bell inequalities (non-local games) [12, 13]. For a pair of free (random) observables, we can show that the degree of their uncertainty is 0. On the other hand, it is interesting that for a sequence of free (random) observables $A_i, i = 1, \ldots, n, n > 4$, the fine-grained uncertainty is upper bounded by $\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}$, which is the same as the one given by the anti-commuting observables. Therefore as a byproduct of above results, by using free (random) observables we can obtain one type of steering inequality with large violation that recently be studied in [14].

II. PRELIMINARIES

Firstly, we need the following terminology: For a typical bipartite dichotomic Bell scenario, we usually suppose there are two observers, say, Alice and Bob, which are separated at a long distance. Suppose each of them is described by a N-dimensional Hilbert space H_N, and Alice (resp. Bob) chooses one of n dichotomic observables A_i (resp. B_j) that will take results α_i (resp. β_j) from set $\{1, -1\}$. Thus mathematically the dichotomic observables are required to be self-adjoint unitaries.

Let us recall the famous CHSH-Bell inequality [3], which plays an important role in experiments for verifying Bell non-locality.

$$|\langle\alpha_1\beta_1\rangle + \langle\alpha_1\beta_2\rangle + \langle\alpha_2\beta_1\rangle - \langle\alpha_2\beta_2\rangle| \leq 2, \tag{1}$$

where the *classical value* 2 is obtained by all local hidden variable model. In [5], Tsirelson first proved that if the correlations are obtained by quantum theory then the *quantum value* of CHSH-Bell inequality is $2\sqrt{2}$. In other words, let us consider the following CHSH-Bell operator

$$B_{CHSH} = A_1 \otimes B_1 + A_1 \otimes B_2 + A_2 \otimes B_1 - A_2 \otimes B_2, \tag{2}$$

where $A_i, B_j, i, j = 1, 2$ are dichotomic observables. By choosing proper observables, e.g. $A_1 = \sigma_x, A_2 = \sigma_z, B_1 = (\sigma_x + \sigma_z)/\sqrt{2}, B_2 = (\sigma_x - \sigma_z)/\sqrt{2}$, the norm (the maximal eigenvalue) of the CHSH-Bell operator is $2\sqrt{2}$. Let us denote $\mathcal{B} = B_{CHSH}^2$, then

$$\mathcal{B} = 4\mathbb{1} - [A_1, A_2] \otimes [B_1, B_2]. \tag{3}$$

If both parties choose compatible (commutative) observables, then $\mathcal{B} = 4\mathbb{1}$. Hence incompatible (non-commutative) observables are necessary for the violation of CHSH-Bell inequality [7]. Regarding to the Tsirelson bound, it is determined by the eigenvalues of the commutators $[A_1, A_2]$ and $[B_1, B_2]$. More precisely, suppose the local dimension for each party is N, and the eigenvalues of $[A_1, A_2]$ (resp. $[B_1, B_2]$) are $s_i, i = 1, \ldots, N$ (resp. $t_j, j = 1, \ldots, N$). Then we have [7]:

$$\|\mathcal{B}\| = \max_{i,j}\{4 + s_i t_j\}. \tag{4}$$

It is clear that if there exist eigenstates such that the eigenvalues of $[A_1, A_2]$ (resp. $[B_1, B_2]$) are ± 2, then $\|B_{CHSH}\| = 2\sqrt{2}$. Therefore, the Tsirelson bound is sufficiently determined by the algebraic relations of local observables. For example, σ_x and σ_z are anti-commutative dichotomic observables.

III. A RANDOM APPROACH TO THE TSIRELSON BOUND

Suppose D is a $N \times N$ deterministic diagonal matrix, where the diagonal terms of D are either 1 or -1. Technically we can assume $Tr(D) = 0$. It is easy to see that $D^2 = \mathbb{1}$. Suppose unitaries $U_i, i = 1, \ldots, n$ are independent random matrices in the group of unitary matrices $U(N)$. U_i's are called Haar random unitaries. Define the random dichotomic observables as follows:

$$A_i = U_i D U_i^\dagger, \ i = 1, \ldots, n. \tag{5}$$

Since a random matrix is a matrix whose entries are real or complex random variables on a given probability space (Ω, P), the results we considered should hold with "high probability". Recall that we call a sequence of random variables $\{X_N\}_N$ convergent to X almost surely in probability space (Ω, P), if $P\left(\lim_{N\to\infty} X_N = X\right) = 1$. With these notions, we claim that the Tsirelson bound of CHSH-Bell inequality can be obtained in high probability by using random dichotomic observables in sufficient large dimension. More precisely, we have following theorem:

Theorem 1 *Let $A_i = U_i D U_i^\dagger$ and $B_i = V_i D V_i^\dagger, i = 1, 2$. U_i, V_i are independent Haar random unitaries in $U(N)$. Then we have*

$$\lim_{N\to\infty} \|B_{CHSH}\| = 2\sqrt{2}, \quad \textit{almost surely.} \tag{6}$$

To prove this theorem, we first need following lemma in [11]:

Lemma 1 *Let $\mathcal{M}_N$ be the set of $N \times N$ matrices, then for every $A \in \mathcal{M}_N$,*

$$\|A\| = \lim_{k\to\infty} \left(tr\left((A^\dagger A)^k\right)\right)^{\frac{1}{2k}}, \tag{7}$$

where $tr = Tr/N$.

Now denote $A = [A_1, A_2]$ and $B = [B_1, B_2]$. For any $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$, by binomial formula and equation (3), we have

$$\begin{aligned} tr(\mathcal{B}^k) &= (4\mathbb{1} - A \otimes B)^k \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^{k} \binom{k}{j} 4^{k-j}(-1)^j tr(A^j) \cdot tr(B^j). \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

Let us consider the term $tr(A^j)$. Since A_1A_2 and A_2A_1 commute, again by binomial formula, we have

$$tr(A^j) = \sum_{l=0}^{j} \binom{j}{l} (-1)^{j-l} tr((A_1A_2)^{2l-j}). \tag{9}$$

Now we need the second key lemma (see Appendix B for the details of proof):

Lemma 2 *Let $A_i = U_i D U_i^\dagger$, where $U_i, i = 1, \ldots, n \in U(N)$ are independent Haar random unitaries, then we have*

$$\lim_{N\to\infty} tr(A_{i(1)}A_{i(2)} \cdots A_{i(k)}) = 0, \quad \textit{almost surely.} \tag{10}$$

where the indices $i(1), \ldots, i(k)$ satisfy following conditions: $i(1) \neq i(2), i(2) \neq i(3), \ldots, i(k-1) \neq i(k)$.

Basically this lemma belongs to B. Collins, since it is a natural corollary of his work in [15, 16], where he and other co-authors developed a method to calculate the moments of polynomial random variables on unitary groups. It is called Weingarten calculus due to the work of Weingarten [17]. In fact, this lemma reveals the asymptotic freeness of random matrices, which means the moments of free random variables in some quantum probability space can be approximated by the ones of random matrices (see next section for more details). Thus by Lemma 2, for almost surely we have

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{N\to\infty} tr(A^j) &= \sum_{l=0}^{j} \binom{j}{l} (-1)^{j-l} \lim_{N\to\infty} tr((A_1A_2)^{2l-j}) \\ &= \begin{cases} (-1)^{j/2}\binom{j}{j/2}, & \text{j is even,} \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

The similar estimate is also valid for the term $tr(B^j)$. Therefore

$$\lim_{N\to\infty} tr(\mathcal{B}^k) = \sum_{j=0,\ \text{j is even}}^{k} \binom{k}{j} 4^{k-j} \binom{j}{j/2}^2 := Q_k, \quad \text{almost surely.} \tag{12}$$

By Stirling's formula, we have $\lim_{k\to\infty}(Q_{2k})^{1/2k} = 8$. Hence let $\epsilon > 0$, we can choose $k \in \mathbb{N}$, such that $(Q_{2k})^{1/2k} > 8-\epsilon$. Since $(tr\mathcal{B}^k)^{1/k} \leq \|\mathcal{B}\|$ for all $k \geq 1$, then we have

$$\liminf_{N\to\infty} \|\mathcal{B}\| \geq (Q_{2k})^{1/2k} > 8 - \epsilon, \quad \text{almost surely.} \tag{13}$$

On the other hand, due to Tsirelson's result [5] we have $\|\mathcal{B}\| \leq 8$. Thus we complete our proof of Theorem 1.

IV. A FREE APPROACH TO THE TSIRELSON BOUND

In fact, the random dichotomic observables are "asymptotic" freely independent, which was first established by Voiculescu [18] in the case of Gaussian unitary ensembles (GUE). That result builds a gorgeous bridge across two

distinct mathematical branches–random matrix theory and free probability. In free probability theory, we will treat observables A_i, B_j as elements of a C^*-algebra $\mathcal{A}$, equipped with an unital (faithful) state ϕ, where unital means $\phi(\mathbb{1}) = 1$ and faithful means $\phi(AA^*) = 0 \Rightarrow A = 0$. The pair $(\mathcal{A}, \phi)$ is called a C^*-probability space, which is a quantum analogue of a classical probability space. For example, $(\mathcal{M}_N, \mathrm{tr})$ is a C^*-probability space, where $\mathcal{M}_N$ is the set of $N \times N$ matrices.

Lemma 2 inspires us to consider the following adaptation of definition of freeness to the case of dichotomic observables:

Definition 1 *For given C^*-probability space $(\mathcal{A}, \phi)$, dichotomic observables $A_i, i \in I$ are called freely independent, if*

$$\phi(A_{i(1)} A_{i(2)} \cdots A_{i(k)}) = 0 \tag{14}$$

whenever we have following:

(i) *k is positive; $i(1), i(2), \ldots, i(k) \in I$;*

(ii) *$\phi(A_{i(k)}) = 0$ for all k;*

(iii) *$i(1) \neq i(2), i(2) \neq i(3), \ldots, i(k-1) \neq i(k)$.*

For the special case $I = \{1, 2\}$, the above conditions are equivalent to

$$\phi(A_1) = \phi(A_2) = \phi(A_1A_2) = \phi(A_2A_1) = \phi(A_1A_2A_1) = \phi(A_2A_1A_2) = \cdots = 0. \tag{15}$$

However, if the local Hilbert dimension is finite, there does not exist such observables which are freely independent. In other words, for fixed N, the C^*-probability space (M_N, tr) is too small to talk about freeness, and Definition 1 is empty since such observables in M_N do not exist. But fortunately if we consider the observables in infinite dimensional Hilbert space, it is possible for them to be freely independent in some C^*-probability space $(\mathcal{A}, \phi)$. On the other hand, the derivations in Section III do not depend on the dimension, i.e, the derivations still hold when we use an infinite dimensional C^*-probability space $(\mathcal{A}, \phi)$ instead of (M_N, tr), and there is a formula which is corresponding to Lemma 1 (see equation (34)). Thus we have following conclusion:

Theorem 2 *For CHSH-Bell inequality, the Tsirelson bound can be obtained by using the observables which are freely independent in their respective local system. More precisely, if A_1, A_2 and B_1, B_2 are freely independent in some C^*-probability space $(\mathcal{A}, \phi)$, then we have $\|B_{CHSH}\| = 2\sqrt{2}$.*

In next subsection, we will provide a concrete example which fulfill the conditions in this theorem.

A. A concrete example in infinite dimension

For infinite dimensional C^*-probability space, Definition 1 is meaningful. Now consider a group $G = *_n \mathbb{Z}_2$ and its associate Hilbert space $\ell_2(G)$. The set $\{|g\rangle : g \in G\}$ forms an orthonormal basis of $\ell_2(G)$, thus the dimension of $\ell_2(G)$ is infinite. Let $\lambda : G \to B(\ell^2(G))$ be left regular group representation, which is defined as:

$$\lambda(g)|h\rangle = |gh\rangle, \ \forall h \in G. \tag{16}$$

The reduced C^*-algebra $C^*_{red}(G)$ is defined as the norm closure of the linear span $\{\lambda(g), g \in G\}$, where the norm is the operator norm of $B(\ell_2(G))$. There is a faithful trace state ϕ on $C^*_{red}(G)$ defined as

$$\phi\Big(\sum_g \alpha_g \lambda(g)\Big) := \alpha_e. \tag{17}$$

Obviously $\phi(\mathbb{1}) = 1$. Hence $(C^*_{red}(G), \phi)$ is a C^*-probability space. Let g_i be the generator of i-th copy of $*_n \mathbb{Z}_2, i = 1, 2, \ldots, n$ and let

$$A_i = \lambda(g_i), \ \ i = 1, \ldots, n, \tag{18}$$

It is easy to check $A_i, i = 1, \ldots, n$ are self-adjoint unitaries and freely independent in $(C^*_{red}(G), \phi)$. Hence if the local Hilbert spaces of Alice and Bob are taken to be $\ell_2(G)$, where $n = 2$. By using those free observables, we can obtain the quantum value $2\sqrt{2}$ for CHSH-Bell inequality. Note here the unitary operation maintains the freeness of observables, i.e, if A_1, A_2 are freely independent, then $UA_1U^\dagger, UA_2U^\dagger$ are still freely independent for any unitary U. Since the norm of Bell operator does not change under the local unitary operation, we can simply assume $A_1 = B_1 = \lambda(g_1), A_2 = B_2 = \lambda(g_2)$.

B. Truncated free observables in finite dimension

In order to see how the freeness behaves in a simple and direct way, we will truncate the free observables given by last subsection to finite dimension. Denote the elements in $\ell_2(*_2\mathbb{Z}_2)$ as following diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccccc} \cdots & |g_2g_1g_2\rangle & |g_2g_1\rangle & |g_2\rangle & |e\rangle & |g_1\rangle & |g_1g_2\rangle & |g_1g_2g_1\rangle & \cdots \\ \updownarrow & \updownarrow & \updownarrow & \updownarrow & \updownarrow & \updownarrow & \updownarrow & \updownarrow & \updownarrow \\ \cdots & |-3\rangle & |-2\rangle & |-1\rangle & |0\rangle & |1\rangle & |2\rangle & |3\rangle & \cdots \end{array}. \tag{19}$$

With above notation, we have

$$\begin{cases} \lambda(g_1)|i\rangle = |j\rangle,\ i+j=1, \\ \lambda(g_2)|i\rangle = |j\rangle,\ i+j=-1. \end{cases} \tag{20}$$

Let us truncate the free observables to $N = 2l+1$ dimension. We denote them as $A_1^{(N)}$ and $A_2^{(N)}$. Then we have (see Figure 1):

$$\begin{cases} A_1^{(N)}|i\rangle = |j\rangle,\ i=-l+1,\ldots,l; j=1-i, \\ A_1^{(N)}|-l\rangle = |-l\rangle, \end{cases} \tag{21}$$

and

$$\begin{cases} A_2^{(N)}|i\rangle = |j\rangle,\ i=-l,\ldots,l-1; j=-1-i, \\ A_2^{(N)}|l\rangle = |l\rangle. \end{cases} \tag{22}$$



Figure 1: The solid line stands for $A_1^{(N)}$ and the dash lines stands for $A_2^{(N)}$, where $N=7$.

It is clear that $A_1^{(N)}$ and $A_2^{(N)}$ are self-adjoint unitaries. Thus they can be treated as a pair of dichotomic observables in N dimensional Hilbert space. Denote $S = A_2^{(N)} \circ A_1^{(N)}$, then we have

$$\begin{cases} S|j\rangle = |j-2\rangle,\ j=-l+2,\ldots,l \\ S|-l+1\rangle = |l\rangle, \\ S|-l\rangle = |l-1\rangle. \end{cases} \tag{23}$$

By following diagram it is easy to see that S is a cyclic in the permutation group S_N.

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccccccc} |l\rangle & \longrightarrow & |l-2\rangle & \longrightarrow & |l-4\rangle & \longrightarrow & \cdots & \longrightarrow & |-l+2\rangle & \longrightarrow & |-l\rangle \\ \nwarrow & & & & & & & & & & \swarrow \\ & |-l+1\rangle & \longleftarrow & |-l+3\rangle & \longleftarrow & \cdots & \longleftarrow & |l-3\rangle & \longleftarrow & |l-1\rangle. & \end{array} \tag{24}$$

Now for the CHSH-Bell operator B_{CHSH}, by using those truncated free observables, we can show that the quantum value tends to $2\sqrt{2}$ as $N \to \infty$. Then due to the fact that the eigenvalues of S are $\lambda_j = \exp^{2\pi ij/N}, j=0,\ldots,N-1$,

we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|B^2_{CHSH}\| &= \left\|4\mathbb{1} - [A_1^{(N)}, A_2^{(N)}] \otimes [A_1^{(N)}, A_2^{(N)}]\right\| \\ &= \left\|4\mathbb{1} - (S^\dagger - S) \otimes (S^\dagger - S)\right\| \\ &= \max_j\{4 + 4(\Im(\lambda_j))^2\} = \max_j\left\{4 + 4\sin^2\frac{2\pi j}{N}\right\} \\ &\approx 4 + 4\left(1 - O\left(\frac{1}{N^2}\right)\right) = 8 - O\left(\frac{1}{N^2}\right).\end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

Here for simplicity, we have assumed that Alice and Bob take same measurements. Therefore, we have following proposition:

Proposition 1 *By using truncated free observables $A_1^{(N)}, A_2^{(N)}, N = 2l+1$, we can asymptotically obtain the Tsirelson bound for CHSH-Bell inequality, i.e, $\|B_{CHSH}\| = 2\sqrt{2} - O(1/N)$.*

V. FINE-GRAINED UNCERTAINTY RELATIONS FOR RANDOM (FREE) OBSERVABLES

Uncertainty principle and non-locality, which are two fundamental and intrinsic concepts of quantum theory, was quantitatively linked by J. Oppenheim and S. Wehner's work [12], where they introduced a notion called "fine-grained uncertainty relations" to quantify the "amount of uncertainty" in a particular physical theory. In dichotomic scenario, suppose we have n dichotomic observables $A_i, i = 1, \ldots, n$. Thus the corresponding measurement settings are $P_i^a = \frac{\mathbb{1}+(-1)^a A_i}{2}, i = 1, \ldots, n; a = 0, 1$. The uncertainty of measurement settings $P_i^0, i = 1, \ldots, n$ is defined as following:

$$\xi_{\vec{0}} = \sup_\rho\left\{\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n Tr(P_i^0\rho)\right\} = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2n}\sup_\rho Tr\left(\sum_{i=1}^n A_i\rho\right). \tag{26}$$

Similarly, the uncertainty of $P_i^1, i = 1, \ldots, n$ is

$$\xi_{\vec{1}} = \sup_\rho\left\{\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n Tr(P_i^1\rho)\right\} = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2n}\sup_\rho Tr\left(\sum_{i=1}^n A_i\rho\right). \tag{27}$$

Noticed that

$$\sup_\rho\left|Tr\left(\sum_{i=1}^n A_i\rho\right)\right| = \left\|\sum_{i=1}^n A_i\right\|. \tag{28}$$

Hence $\xi_{\vec{0}} = \xi_{\vec{1}} = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2n}\left\|\sum_{i=1}^n A_i\right\|$. The state ρ which can obtain $\xi_{\vec{x}}$ is called the maximally certain state for those measurement settings. If we assume A_i are freely independent observables, then we have following proposition (see Appendix C and D for the proof):

Proposition 2 *The fine-grained uncertainty for free observables $A_i, i = 1, \ldots, n, n > 4$ is*

$$\xi_{\vec{0}} = \xi_{\vec{1}} \leq \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} < 1. \tag{29}$$

The same results hold for random observables $A_i = U_i D U_i^\dagger, i = 1, \ldots, n, n > 4$ with high probability.

For the special case $n = 2$, we have $\|A_1 + A_2\| = 2$. Thus for $n = 2$, $\xi_{\vec{0}} = \xi_{\vec{1}} = 1$ (see Appendix D for random observables and Appendix E for free obervables). Interestingly, for truncated free observables we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|A_1^{(N)} + A_2^{(N)}\|^2 &= 2\mathbb{1} + S + S^\dagger = \max_j\{2 + 2\Re(\lambda_j)\} \\ &= \max_j\left\{2 + 2\cos\frac{2\pi j}{N}\right\} = 4.\end{aligned} \tag{30}$$

Thus for the truncated free observables, we always have $\xi_{\vec{0}} = \xi_{\vec{1}} = 1$ regardless of what dimension we truncate to.

In a recent work, some of us show that there is a tight relationship between fine-grained uncertainty and violation of one specific steering inequalities, called linear steering inequality, which was first used in [19] to verify steering by experiment. It has following form:

$$S_n = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \langle \alpha_i A_i \rangle \leq C_n, \tag{31}$$

where C_n is called the *local hidden state* bound of S_n. This bound can be calculated easily as follows [19]:

$$C_n = \sup_{\alpha_i = \pm 1} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^{n} \alpha_i A_i \right\|. \tag{32}$$

If the observables A_i are chosen to be operators of Clifford algebra, which are anti-commutative, a large (unbounded) violation can be obtained [14]. Because the degree of the fine-grained uncertainty of free or random observables is as the same order of anti-commuting observables, thus we can make following conclusion:

Corollary 1 *If $A_i, i = 1, \ldots, n$ are chosen to be free observables, then the local hidden state bound of steering inequality $S_n = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \langle \alpha_i A_i \rangle \leq C_n$, is upper bounded by $2\sqrt{n}$. The similar result holds for random observables with high probability.*

Here we note that for the free case, we should also care about the quantum values of steering inequalities. Due to M. Navascués and D. Pérez-Garcí's work, there are two different ways to define them [20]. One is in a commuting way that means the system described by a total Hilbert space, and the other one is the total system described in a tensor form. As a matter of fact, they also used the free observables $\lambda(g_i), i = 1, \ldots, n$ to define the linear steering inequality. They showed the quantum value defined in the commuting sense is n, while in the tensor scenario is upper bounded by $2\sqrt{n-1}$. So by their work, we can easily see that the local hidden state bound is upper bounded by $2\sqrt{n-1}$ for free observables. Their bound is even sharper than ours. However, we have provided another proof which is more focus on the freeness property and is applicable to random observables.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper, we are able to obtain the Tsirelson bound for CHSH-Bell inequality by using random dichotomic observables. In other wards, we have shown that maximally violating CHSH-Bell inequality is generic for random observables. Different to the known results, random observables do not satisfy anti-commuting relations. Instead, due to Voiculescu's theory, they are asymptotic freely independent. It means when the dimension increases, their behaviors tends to the ones of free observables in some quantum probability space. Another main result of this paper is that we have considered the fine-grained uncertainty of a sequence of free or random observables. The degree of their uncertainty is as the same order as the one which is given by the anti-commuting observables. As a byproduct of this result, we can construct a linear steering inequality with large violation by using free or random observables. For further applications, free observables may be used for studying the quantum value of other type of Bell inequalities. Thus a natural question arises: *Is it free observables always maximally violate any Bell inequalities?* Unfortunately, a quick answer is that we can consider the linear Bell operator $\sum_{i=1}^{n} A_i \otimes A_i$. It is trivial since its quantum and classical value are both n, while the quantum value given by free observables is upper bounded by $2\sqrt{n}$. However, it seems promising when considering other specific Bell inequalities. Since the free observables and their truncated ones are deterministic (constructive), another possible application is that it may reverse what we have done in some problems where the random approach are known while the constructive one are unknown.

Acknowledgments—We would like to thank Paweł Horodecki, Marek Bozejko, Mikael de la Salle, Yanqi Qiu and Junghee Ryu for valuable discussions. This work is supported by ERC AdG QOLAPS, EU grant RAQUEL and the Foundation for Polish Science TEAM project cofinanced by the EU European Regional Development Fund. Z. Yin was partly supported by NSFC under Grant No.11301401. A. Rutkowski was supported by a postdoc internship decision number DEC– 2012/04/S/ST2/00002, from the Polish National Science Center. M. Marciniak was supported by EU project BRISQ2. Harrow was funded by NSF grants CCF-1111382 and CCF-1452616, ARO contract W911NF-12-1-0486 and a Leverhulme Trust Visiting Professorship VP2-2013-041.

[1] A. Einstein, B. Podolsky and N. Rosen, Phys. Rev. **47**, 777, (1935).

[2] J. S. Bell, Physics, **1**, 195 (1964).
[3] J. F. Clauser, M. A. Horne, A. Shimony and R. A. Holt, Phys. Rev. Lett. **23**, 880 (1969).
[4] N. Brunner, D. Cavalcanti, S. Pironio, V. Scarani, S. Wehner, Rev. Mod. Phys. **86**, 419 (2014).
[5] B. S. Tsirelson, Lett. Math. Phys. **4**, 93 (1980).
[6] N. Gisin and A. Peres, Phys. Lett. A **162**, 15-17 (1992).
[7] S. L. Braunstein, A. Mann, and M. Revzen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **68**, 3259 (1992).
[8] Z. B. Chen, J. W. Pan, G. Hou, and Y. D. Zhang, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 040406 (2002).
[9] Y. C. Liang, N. Harrigan, S. D. Bartlett, and T. Rudolph, Phys. Rev. Lett. **104**, 050401 (2010).
[10] D. Voiculescu, K. J. Dykema, and A. Nica, *Free Random Variables,* CRM Monograph Series 1, AMS (1992).
[11] A. Nica and R. Speicher, *Lectures on the Combinatorics of Free Probability.*
[12] J. Oppenheim and S. Wehner, Science. **330**, 1072 (2010).
[13] R. Ramanathan, D. Goyeneche, P. Mironowicz, and P. Horodecki, Arxiv 1506.05100 (2015).
[14] M. Marciniak, A. Rutkowski, Z. Yin, M. Horodecki, and R. Horodecki, Phys. Rev. Lett. **115**, 170401 (2015).
[15] B. Collins, Int. Math. Res. Not. **17**, 953-982 (2002).
[16] B. Collins and P. Śniady, Comm. Math. Phys. **264** (3), 773-795 (2004).
[17] D. Weingarten, J. Math. Phys. **19**, 999 (1978).
[18] D. Voiculescu, Invent. Math. **104**, 201-220 (1991).
[19] D. J. Saunders, S. J. Jones, H. M. Wiseman and G. J. Pryde, Nature. Phys. **6**, 845 (2010).
[20] M. Navascués and D. Pérez-Garcí, Phys. Rev. Lett. **109**, 160405 (2012).
[21] B. Collins and C. Male, To appear in Annales Scientifique de l'ENS. ArXiv:1105.4345 (2013).
[22] N. Brown and N. Ozawa, *Graduate Studies in Mathematics*, vol. **88**, AMS (2008).
[23] M. Epping, H. Kampermann, and D. Bruß, Phys. Rev. Lett. **111**, 240404 (2013).
[24] R. F. Werner and M. M. Wolf, Phys. Rev. A. **64**, 032112 (2001).
[25] M. Zukowski and C. Brukner, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 210401 (2002).

Appendix

A. C^*-probability space and freely independent

Definition 2 *A $*$-probability space $(\mathcal{A}, \phi)$ consists of an unital $*$-algebra $\mathcal{A}$ over $\mathbb{C}$ and an unital linear positive functional*

$$\phi : \mathcal{A} \to \mathbb{C}; \quad \phi(1_{\mathcal{A}}) = 1. \tag{33}$$

The elements $a \in \mathcal{A}$ are called non-commutative random variables in $(\mathcal{A}, \phi)$. A C^*-probability space is a $*$-probability space $(\mathcal{A}, \phi)$ where $\mathcal{A}$ is an unital C^*-algebra.

If additionally we assume ϕ is faithful, we have for any $a \in \mathcal{A}$,

$$\|a\| = \lim_{k\to\infty} \left(\phi\left((a^*a)^k\right)\right)^{\frac{1}{2k}}. \tag{34}$$

Definition 3 *[11, 21] For given C^*-probability space $(\mathcal{A}, \varphi)$, let $\mathcal{A}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{A}_n$ be $*$-subalgebras of $\mathcal{A}$. They are said to be free if for all $a_i \in \mathcal{A}_{j(i)}, i = 1, \ldots n,\ j(i) \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$ such that $\phi(a_i) = 0$, one has*

$$\phi(a_1 a_2 \cdots a_n) = 0 \tag{35}$$

whenever $j(1) \neq j(2), j(2) \neq j(3), \ldots, j(n-1) \neq j(n)$. A sequence of random variables are said to be free if the unital subalgebras they generate are free.

B. Proofs for Lemma 2

Lemma 2 is a direct corollary of the work of B. Collins [15]. A random variable $u \in (\mathcal{A}, \phi)$ is called a Haar unitary when it is unitary and

$$\phi(u^j) = \begin{cases} 1, & j = 0, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{36}$$

Since we have

$$\lim_{N\to\infty} tr(D^j) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{j is even,} \\ 0, & \text{j is odd.} \end{cases} \tag{37}$$

Then there will exist a C^*-probability space $(\mathcal{A},\phi)$ and a random variable $d\in\mathcal{A}$, such that

$$\lim_{N\to\infty} tr(D^j)=\phi(d^j),\quad \text{for all } j\geq 0. \tag{38}$$

Let $u_1,\ldots,u_n$ be a sequence of Haar unitaries in $(\mathcal{A},\phi)$ which are freely independent together with d. We will give a concrete example of $u_1,\ldots,u_n,d$ in the end of this subsection. Let $E(\cdot)=\int\cdot\, d\mu$, where $d\mu$ is the Haar measure on $U(N)$, then by the main theorem of [15, Theorem 3.1], we have following:

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{N\to\infty} E\, tr(A_{i(1)}A_{i(2)}\cdots A_{i(k)}) &= \phi(u_{i(1)}du^*_{i(1)}\cdots u_{i(k)}du^*_{i(k)})\\ &=0,\end{aligned} \tag{39}$$

where the second equation comes from the freeness of $d,u_1,\ldots,u_n$. Moreover, by theorem of [15, Theorem 3.5]

$$P\left(\left|tr(A_{i(1)}A_{i(2)}\cdots A_{i(k)})\right|\geq\epsilon\right)=O(N^{-2}). \tag{40}$$

Then by Borel-Cantelli Lemma, for any $\epsilon>0$,

$$\limsup_{N\to\infty}\left|tr(A_{i(1)}A_{i(2)}\cdots A_{i(k)})\right|\leq\epsilon,\quad \text{almost surely.} \tag{41}$$

Hence

$$\lim_{N\to\infty} tr(A_{i(1)}A_{i(2)}\cdots A_{i(k)})=0,\quad \text{almost surely.} \tag{42}$$

A concrete example of $u_1,\ldots,u_n$ and d.

Let $G=*_{2n+1}\mathbb{Z}_2$ and $g_i,i=1,\ldots,2n+1$ be the generator of the i-th copy. Let $u_i=\lambda(g_{2i-1}g_{2i}),i=1,\ldots,n$ and $d=\lambda(g_{2n+1})$. Then the C^*-probability we consider is $(C^*_{red}(G),\phi)$ which was defined in Subsection IV A. It is easy to check equations (36) and (38) hold. Thus $u_i,i=1,\ldots,n$ are Haar unitaries in $(C^*_{red}(G),\phi)$. Moreover $u_1,\ldots,u_n,d$ are freely independent in $(C^*_{red}(G),\phi)$.

C. Proof of Proposition 2

Suppose the dichotomic observables $A_i,i=1,\ldots,n$ are freely independent in some C^*-probability space $(\mathcal{A},\phi)$, then by equation (34),

$$\begin{aligned}\left\|\sum_{i=1}^n A_i\right\| &= \lim_{k\to\infty}\left(\phi\left(\sum_{i=1}^n A_i\right)^{2k}\right)^{\frac{1}{2k}}\\ &= \lim_{k\to\infty}\left(\phi\left(\sum_{i(1),\ldots,i(2k)=1}^{n} A_{i(1)}\cdots A_{i(2k)}\right)\right)^{\frac{1}{2k}}.\end{aligned} \tag{43}$$

To estimate above equation. We need following definitions and facts in combinatorial mathematics [11]. For given set $\{1,\ldots,2k\}$, there is a partition $\pi=\{V_1,\ldots,V_s\}$ of this set. π is determined as follows: Two numbers p and q belong to the same block V_k of π if and only if $i(p)=i(q)$. There is a particular partition called pair partition, in which every block only contains two elements. A pair partition of $\{1,\ldots,2k\}$ is called non-crossing if there does not exist $1\leq p_1<q_1<p_2<q_2\leq 2k$ such that p_1 is paired with p_2 and q_1 is paired with q_2. The number of non-crossing pair partitions of the set $\{1,\ldots,2k\}$ is given by the Catalan number $C_k=\frac{1}{k+1}\binom{2k}{k}$.

Now for the indices $i(1),\ldots,i(2k)$, if there exist a pair of adjacent indices which they belong to a same block, e.g. $i(s-1)=i(s)$, then we will shrink the indices $i(1),\ldots,i(2k)$ to $i(1),\ldots,i(s-2),null,i(s+1),\ldots,i(2k)$, since obviously $A_{i(s-1)}A_{i(s)}=\mathbb{1}$. According to this rule, we can shrink π to a new partition $\tilde{\pi}$ on $\{1,\ldots,2t\}$, where $t\leq k$. Hence we can divide π into two groups:

Case 1. $\tilde{\pi}=null$.

Case 2. The indices in $\tilde{\pi}$ are satisfy condition (iii) in Definition 1, i.e, the adjacent indices are not equal.

We decompose $\phi\left(\sum_{i=1}^n A_i\right)^{2k}$ into two terms:

$$\phi\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} A_i\right)^{2k} = \phi \sum_{\pi\in\Pi_1} \cdot + \phi \sum_{\pi\in\Pi_2} \cdot := II_1 + II_2, \tag{44}$$

where the set of partitions Π_1 and Π_2 is defined as follows: Partition $\pi \in \Pi_1$ if and only if π belongs to Case 1. And $\pi \in \Pi_2$ if and only if π belongs to Case 2.

By our assumption, i.e, freeness of A_i, $II_2 = 0$. For the term II_1, it is easy to see that II_1 is equal to the cardinality of the set Π_1. Due to shrink process, $\pi \in \Pi_1$ only if there is even number of elements for every block. Those partitions with even elements in every block can be realized in following process: First choosing an arbitrary non-crossing pair partition, then combining some proper blocks to one block. Hence the number of $\pi \in \Pi_1$ is upper bounded by $C_k n^k$. Thus

$$\phi\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} A_i\right)^{2k} \leq C_k n^k. \tag{45}$$

Therefore under our assumption,

$$\left\|\sum_{i=1}^{n} A_i\right\| = \lim_{k\to\infty} \left(\phi\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} A_i\right)^{2k}\right)^{\frac{1}{2k}} \leq 2\sqrt{n}. \tag{46}$$

Note: For the local hidden state bound C_n of steering inequality S_n in equation (32), the variables α_i do not make any effort to the whole derivation. Thus C_n is also upper bounded by $2\sqrt{n}$.

D. Fine-grained uncertainty for random observables

In fact, the statement is a corollary of the work of B. Collins and C. Male [21]. Here we restate their result as following: Let $A_i = U_i D U_i^\dagger$, then there exist C^*-probability space $(\mathcal{A}, \phi)$ and Haar unitaries $u_1, \ldots, u_n$ which are freely independent of element $d \in \mathcal{A}$, such that

$$\lim_{N\to\infty} \left\|\sum_{i=1}^{n} A_i\right\| = \left\|\sum_{i=1}^{n} u_i d u_i^*\right\|, \text{ almost surely.} \tag{47}$$

Denote $a_i = u_i d u_i^*$, it is easy to see that $a_1, \ldots, a_n$ are freely independent in $(\mathcal{A}, \phi)$. Hence due to a similar argument in Appendix C, we have $\|\sum_{i=1}^{n} u_i d u_i^*\| \leq 2\sqrt{n}$. Therefore we have following corollary:

Corollary 2 *Let $A_i = U_i D U_i^\dagger, i = 1, \ldots, n$, U_i are independent random matrices in $U(N)$. Then we have*

$$\lim_{N\to\infty} \left\|\sum_{i=1}^{n} A_i\right\| \leq 2\sqrt{n}, \quad \textit{almost surely.} \tag{48}$$

For the special case $n = 2$, we have following corollary:

Corollary 3 *Let $A_i = U_i D U_i^\dagger, i = 1, 2$, U_i are independent random matrices in $U(N)$. Then we have*

$$\lim_{N\to\infty} \left\|\sum_{i=1}^{2} A_i\right\| = 2, \quad \textit{almost surely.} \tag{49}$$

Proof. For all $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$, then almost surely we have

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{N\to\infty} tr\left(A_1 + A_2\right)^{2k} &= \sum_{j=0}^{k} \binom{k}{j} 2^{k-j} \sum_{l=0}^{j} \binom{j}{l} \lim_{N\to\infty} tr\left(A_1 A_2\right)^{2l-j} \\ &= \sum_{j=0,\ \text{even}}^{k} \binom{k}{j} 2^{k-j} \binom{j}{j/2}. \end{aligned} \tag{50}$$

Since $\lim_{k\to\infty}\left(\sum_{j=0,\text{ even}}^{k}\binom{k}{j}2^{k-j}\binom{j}{j/2}\right)^{\frac{1}{2k}}=2$, then by the standard argument in this sequel, we have

$$\liminf_{N\to\infty}\left\|\sum_{i=1}^{2}A_i\right\|\geq 2-\epsilon,\text{ almost surely.}\tag{51}$$

On the other hand, $\left\|\sum_{i=1}^{2}A_i\right\|\leq 2$ is obvious.

E. Maximally certain states for $\xi_{\vec{0}}$ and $\xi_{\vec{1}}$ in the case $n=2$

Let $A_1=\lambda(g_1),A_2=\lambda(g_2)$, where g_1,g_2 are generator of group $*_2\mathbb{Z}_2$. We need following notions.

Definition 4 *A group G is amenable if there exists a state μ on $\ell_\infty(G)$ which is invariant under the left translation action: i.e. for all $s\in G$ and $f\in\ell_\infty(G),\mu(s\cdot f)=\mu(f)$.*

Definition 5 *Let G be a group, a Følner net (sequence) is a net of non-empty finite subsets $F_n\subset G$ such that $|F_n\cap gF_n|/|F_n|\to 1$ for all $g\in G$. Where gF_n denotes the subset $\{gh:h\in F_n\}$.*

For any $g\in G$, there exists N, such that for all $n\geq N$, $g\in F_n$. There are many characterizations of amenable groups.

Proposition 3 *[22] Let G be a discrete group. The following are equivalent:*

i) *G is amenable;*

ii) *G has a Følner net (sequence);*

iii) *For any finite subset $E\subset G$, we have $\frac{1}{|E|}\left\|\sum_{g\in E}\lambda(g)\right\|=1$.*

For instance, group $*_2\mathbb{Z}_2$ is amenable. Hence by above proposition, $\|\lambda(g_1)+\lambda(g_2)\|=2$. With above notions, we can formally define a state

$$\rho_n=\frac{1}{|F_n|}\sum_{g,h\in F_n}|g\rangle\langle h|,\tag{52}$$

where F_n is a Følner sequence of $G=*_2\mathbb{Z}_2$. Now we have:

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{n\to\infty}Tr((\lambda(g_1)+\lambda(g_2))\rho_n)&=\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{|F_n|}\left(\sum_{g,h\in F_n}\langle h|g_1g\rangle+\sum_{g,h\in F_n}\langle h|g_2g\rangle\right)\\&=\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{|F_n|}(|F_n\cap g_1F_n|+|F_n\cap g_2F_n|)=2,\end{aligned}\tag{53}$$

where for the second equation we have used the property of Følner sequence. Thus in this approximate sense, the fine-grained uncertainty of A_1^0 and A_2^0 is 1. Technically we can construct $\tilde{\rho}_n$ to approximate $\xi_{\vec{1}}$. Firstly we define two subsets of $G=*_2\mathbb{Z}_2$:

$$G_1=\{g_1,g_1g_2,g_1g_2g_1,\cdots\}\text{ and }G_2=\{g_2,g_2g_1,g_2g_1g_2,\cdots\}.\tag{54}$$

In fact, G_1 (resp. G_2) is the subset of wards which begin with g_1 (resp. g_2). It is easy to see $G_1\cup G_2\cup\{e\}=G$. Now we define a state:

$$|\tilde{\phi}_n\rangle=\frac{1}{\sqrt{|F_n|}}\sum_{g\in F_n}e^{i\theta_g}|g\rangle,\tag{55}$$

where F_n is still a Følner sequence of G and

$$\theta_g=\begin{cases}\pi/2 & g\in G_1,\\ -\pi/2 & g\in G_2,\\ 0 & g=e.\end{cases}\tag{56}$$

Let $\tilde{\rho}_n = |\tilde{\phi}_n\rangle\langle\tilde{\phi}_n|$, then we have

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{n\to\infty} Tr((\lambda(g_1)+\lambda(g_2))\tilde{\rho}_n) &= \lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{|F_n|}\sum_{g,h\in F_n} e^{i(\theta_g-\theta_h)}\left(\langle h|g_1 g\rangle + \langle h|g_2 g\rangle\right)\\ &= \lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{|F_n|}\left(\sum_{g\in F_n\cap g_1F_n} e^{i(\theta_g-\theta_{g_1 g})} + \sum_{g\in F_n\cap g_2F_n} e^{i(\theta_g-\theta_{g_2 g})}\right).\end{aligned} \tag{57}$$

For the first of term of right hand side, for large enough n, we can say $e, g_1 \in F_n$. Therefore $e, g_1 \in F_n \cap g_1F_n$ for large enough n. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{|F_n|}\sum_{g\in F_n\cap g_1F_n} e^{i(\theta_g-\theta_{g_1 g})} &= \frac{1}{|F_n|}\sum_{g\in F_n\cap g_1F_n, g\neq\{e,g_1\}} e^{i(\theta_g-\theta_{g_1 g})} + \frac{1}{|F_n|}e^{i(\theta_e-\theta_{g_1 e})} + \frac{1}{|F_n|}e^{i(\theta_{g_1}-\theta_{g_1 g_1})}\\ &= \frac{1}{|F_n|}\sum_{g\in F_n\cap g_1F_n, g\neq\{e,g_1\}} e^{i\pi} = -\frac{|F_n\cap g_1F_n|-2}{|F_n|},\end{aligned} \tag{58}$$

where for the second equation we have used (56). A similar argument is valid for the second term of right hand side of (57). Thus finally we have

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} Tr((\lambda(g_1)+\lambda(g_2))\tilde{\rho}_n) = -2. \tag{59}$$

F. Quantum value of complex CHSH-Bell inequality

In this appendix we will consider a Bell inequality which has a similar form of CHSH-Bell inequality. The Bell operator is defined as follows:

$$\mathcal{B} = A_1\otimes B_1 + A_1\otimes B_2 + A_2\otimes B_1 + \omega A_2\otimes B_2, \tag{60}$$

where $\omega = e^{\frac{2\pi i}{3}}$. Here the observables are not dichotomic. Instead, there are three possible outcomes: $1, \omega, \omega^2$. Thus A_i, B_j are required to be unitaries and satisfy $A_i^3 = B_j^3 = \mathbb{1}$ for any $i, j = 1, 2$. The classical value of this Bell functional is $\sqrt{7}$.

Now for the quantum value, we can assume $A_1 = B_1, A_2 = B_2$ and A_1, A_2 are freely independent in some C^*-probability space. Hence we have

$$\mathcal{B}\mathcal{B}^\dagger = 3\mathbb{1}\otimes\mathbb{1} + (\mathbb{1}-\omega A)\otimes(\mathbb{1}-\omega A), \tag{61}$$

where $A = A_1A_2^\dagger + \omega A_2A_1^\dagger$. By binomial formula we have

$$tr(\mathcal{B}\mathcal{B}^\dagger)^k = \sum_{j=0}^{k}\binom{k}{j}3^{k-j}\left(\sum_{l=0,\text{l is even}}^{j}\binom{j}{l}\binom{l}{l/2}\right)^2 := Q_k. \tag{62}$$

On one hand, by Stirling's formula, for even l, $\binom{l}{l/2} \leq 2^l$, thus

$$Q_k \leq \sum_{j=0}^{k}\binom{k}{j}3^{k-j}\left(\sum_{l=0}^{j}\binom{j}{l}2^l\right)^2 = 12^k. \tag{63}$$

By Lemma 1, we have $\|\mathcal{B}\| \leq 2\sqrt{3}$. By a slightly adaption of the results in [23], where they provided a method to estimate the quantum value for given dichotomic Bell inequalities, we can conclude that $2\sqrt{3}$ is an upper bound for the quantum value of complex CHSH Bell inequality. In fact, this upper bound can be obtained by choosing:

$$A_1 = B_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1\\ \omega^2 & 0 & 0\\ 0 & \omega & 0\end{pmatrix},\ A_2 = B_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & -\omega\\ 0 & 1 & 0\\ \omega^2 & 0 & 0\end{pmatrix}. \tag{64}$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} Q_{2k} &= \sum_{j=0}^{k} \binom{2k}{2j} 3^{2k-2j} \left(\sum_{l=0}^{j} \binom{2j}{2l} \binom{2l}{l} \right)^2 + \sum_{j=1}^{k} \binom{2k}{2j-1} 3^{2k-2j+1} \left(\sum_{l=0}^{j-1} \binom{2j-1}{2l} \binom{2l}{l} \right)^2 \\ &\approx \sum_{j=0}^{k} \binom{2k}{2j} 3^{2k-2j} \left(\sum_{l=0}^{j} \binom{2j}{2l} 2^{2l} \right)^2 + \sum_{j=1}^{k} \binom{2k}{2j-1} 3^{2k-2j+1} \left(\sum_{l=0}^{j-1} \binom{2j-1}{2l} 2^{2l} \right)^2 \\ &\gtrsim \sum_{j=0}^{k} \binom{2k}{2j} 3^{2k-2j} \left(\sum_{l=0}^{j} \binom{j}{l} 2^{2l} \right)^2 + \sum_{j=1}^{k} \binom{2k}{2j-1} 3^{2k-2j+1} \left(\sum_{l=0}^{j-1} \binom{j-1}{l} 2^{2l} \right)^2 \\ &\approx \sum_{j=0}^{2k} \binom{2k}{j} 3^{2k-j} 5^j = 8^{2k}. \end{aligned} \tag{65}$$

Therefore $\|\mathcal{B}\| \geq 2\sqrt{2} > \sqrt{7}$.

This method is also promising for the famous MABK Bell inequalities [24, 25].